

I CLAIM:

17. . Electronic Commerce System for procuring goods/services by a number of users within an organization, from a number of vendors, comprising consisting of

- (a) one page electronic purchasing document which collectively replaces individual paper and electronic purchase requisitions, purchase orders and vendors; acknowledgements, shipping notices, invoices, and statements; and successively serves their identical functions, traveling electronically between participants of the system; and
- (b) an electronic purchaser's system to introduce each One Page document to the system of serving these purchasing functions, progressively moving the document to the participants, following each step to recognize actions completed, verifications completed, actions needed, and sending the document to the next action location, coupled with a time schedule for each action, and a follow up system;
- (c) a One Page template worksheet selected by the purchase originator when securing and preparing the One Page document, to disclose justification of the purchase, possible supporting data, and in the case of contract orders, information on contract dates, purchases to date and past performance;
- (d) a purchaser's payment system activated by the operation of the One Page document, arranging payment to the vendor's bank, without individual participation within the purchaser's organization;
- (e) exclusive rights in the use of the forms contained herein, referred to as template forms, and to any other forms associated with the One Page document; and
- (f) use of a plurality of terminals, work stations, servers, Intranet and Internet programs operating with "off the shelf" software systems chosen from selections current at the time of installing the One Page System, compatible with retained legacy systems, necessary to operate the One Page System.

18. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a One Page document used to perform the functions of the system, is selected from a choice of three forms of purchasing, by size and type of purchase, and provides for the needs of the different participants, as prepared by the originator.

19. System as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, ~~which is first processed by with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle, to through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action~~, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

20 . System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor acknowledges the order by inserting the vendor's invoice number in the One Page document, and Emailing it back to the purchaser's System, thereby avoiding any problems of the vendor not having a compatible electronic signature system.

21. System as defined in claim 17, wherein electronic signatures are required of ~~those employees engaged in purchasing, purchaser's participating employees to acknowledge their assigned actions completed, which, by using the One Page document, easily permits verification of their actions completed, by others, including auditors checking for prescribed conformance in the purchasing system and will thus be shown to ease verification of the entire One Page document through its successive steps, and to assist the auditing functions.~~

22. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the total amount of the One Page document, including taxes, handling charges, etc. will be established at the outset,

when the document is prepared, thereby having the correct amount for authorization approval, vendor acceptance, and payment advice to the paying bank, without the usual need for a vendor's invoice, before arranging payment.

23. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the purchaser is required to prearrange terms of payment with the vendor, which is scheduled into the system, thereby permitting the purchaser to adjust payments to fit the purchaser's cash flow needs, and without this, the vendor would have no basis for being paid.

24.. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor attaches a bar code label to the outside of the order shipped, displaying the purchase document and invoice numbers, which will be used by the receiver to identify the One Page document for verification of receipt, thereby eliminating the usual shipping document.

25. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a member of the purchaser's receiving department uses a hand held computer and the vendor's bar code reference, to reveal the items listed on the One Page document, clicking in the space provided to confirm receipt of each item, and when the order is completely checked, the member's electronic signature will be accepted by the system, ready for the originator's signature of acceptance, thereby using the original One Page form to avoid any mistakes in identification of the order content.

26. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a section is contained in the One Page document for the originator to enter the amounts and accounts to be charged for the items purchased, which is entered into the system to be held in suspense until the item is received as acknowledged, and charged to that account(s) with an accounts payable entry.

27. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor is permitted to put a "stop"

on the preparation and processing of their documents replaced by the system, but continuing the use of the invoice number as identified with the One Page document, thereby saving substantial work and cost for the vendor.

28. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a Purchase Worksheet provides a choice for either fixed assets or expenses applicable to larger purchases which justify the purchase, and provides information on use of items replaced, depreciation reserves, writeoffs,, other purchases required, etc., with this worksheet made an addition to the One Page document for internal use and fitted into a program for "other purchase actions", such as accounting and taxes, along with its use for auditing the One Page System.

29. System as defined in claim 17. wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection such as , including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

APPEAL TO REJECTION OF ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM
Patent Application No. 09/945,467

Page No.



INDEX

Clarification of New Matters	1-9
Claims Not Having Possession	10
Claims Indefinite in Subject Matter	11-17
Non Obviousness Approval	18-83
Prime Facie Considerations	19
A New Product	20-23
A Useful Product	24-25
Summary	26-27
Combinations of Groups	28-29
Scope and Content	30-34
Consensus of Four Groups*	35
Group A*(Claims 17,20,24.27.28)	36-62
Group B* (Claims 18,19,26)	63-68
Group C* (Claims 21,22,23,25)	69-77
Group D* (Claims 29,30)	78-83
Appendix	84-145
One Page Purchasing System – Abstract	84
Claims	85-88
References in Patents	89-91
Wiecha	92-102
Thomson	103-110
Josephson	111-115
Johnson	116-123
Ivanov	124-129
Walker	130-136
Barnes	137-145

*See Differences Between Applicant's Claims and Examiner's Patents cited for Obviousness, reported in individual Groups.

Title: One Page Purchasing System



Application No. 09/945,467

INTRODUCING NEW MATTERS UNDER 35 U.S.C.132, REQUIRING CLARIFICATION

Clarification of New Matters Contained in Amended Claims as Supported by Specifications and Original Claims Filed 9/4/01, Amended 2/06/03

Response to Detailed Action listing New Matters in amended claim, pages 2-4, with notification to clarify the following items and point out support for the newly added limitations in the originally filed specifications and claims, or cancel the new claims.

New Matter:

A template worksheet
Exclusive rights in the user of the forms
Template forms
Compatible with retained legacy systems
The finder
Template form
Purchase Menu secured on the originator's monitor, and assigned purchase key

Rejection of Claims 18-30 dependent on Claim 17 rejection

Disclosed in:

Claim 17c, line 14
Claim 17e, lines 22-24
Claim 17e line 23
Claim 17f line 28
Claim 19, line 3
Claim 19, line 5
Claim 29, lines 2-3

Claim 17

(See responses contained in the following pages, by claim number)

Note: All evidence in this Section supports the conclusion that there is no New Matter of substance to cause rejection of the claims affected.

CLAIM 17c - CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "a template worksheet", disclosed in Claim 17c, line 14

Amended Claim 17c:

- (c) a One Page template worksheet selected by the purchase originator when securing and preparing the One Page document, to disclose justification of the purchase, possible supporting data, and in the case of contract orders, information on contract dates, purchases to date and past performance;

"
Note: "template" is a commonly used word in electronics, which may be used to denote an electronic master original form available from which to make electronic copies on the monitor. It is only used in this application to indicate the manner in which copies can be secured from the computer, for the convenience of the user, and not to subrogate the meaning of "forms" or work sheet for those contained herein. By its addition to the claim, the user gets better direction for sourcing it from a menu.

It does not deserve identification as a new matter, and if the Examiner continues to consider it "new matter", I authorize it to be cancelled.

Use of "worksheet" can be identified to the claim description contained in Claim 10 of the original Application.

Title: One Page Purchasing System

Application No. 09/945,467

CLAIM 17e - CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "Exclusive rights in use of the formsdocuments as disclosed in". shown in
Claim 17(e) lines 22-24

Amendment Claim 17(e)

- (e) exclusive rights in the use of the forms contained herein, referred to as
template forms, and to any other forms associated with the One Page
document; and

This is an extension of the protection to be covered by contents of the patent application
which includes exhibits of these original documents:

Purchase Document
Purchase Worksheet – Fixed Assets
Purchase Short Order
Contract Purchase
Contract Purchase
Contract Purchase Worksheet
Action Change Request
Vendor Remittance Sheet
Statement to Vendor
And
16 Management Reports identified.

Plus references in the Summary of the Invention

Proposed acceptance of this claim for the following reasons:

The above evidence of existing proprietary forms in the Application should permit the
right to bring additional attention to these original documents and extend the security
advantages, in their inclusion as a claim.

CLAIM 17e - CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "template forms", disclosed in Claim 17e, line 23

Amended Claim 17e:

- (e) exclusive rights in the use of the forms contained herein, referred to as template forms, and to any other forms associated with the One Page document; and

"Note: "template" is a commonly used word in electronics, which may be used to denote an electronic master original form available from which to make electronic copies on the monitor. It is only used in this application to indicate the manner in which copies can be secured from the computer, for the convenience of the user, and not to subrogate the meaning of "forms" or work sheet for those contained herein. By its addition to the claim, the user gets better direction for sourcing it from a menu.

It does not deserve identification as a new matter. If the Examiner continues to consider it "new matter", I authorize "template" to be cancelled.

Howard D. Hynes

Title: One Page Purchasing System

Application No. 09/945,467

CLAIM 17(f)- CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject:"compatible with retained legacy systems", as disclosed in Claim 17(f) line 28

Amended Claim:

- (f) use of a plurality of terminals, work stations, servers, Intranet and Internet programs operating with "off the shelf" software systems chosen from selections current at the time of installing the One Page System, compatible with retained legacy systems, necessary to operate the One Page System.

Proposed that the above claim be approved in its present form, for the following reasons;

The One Page Purchasing System is very comprehensive, requiring a number of new applications to be installed, which could cause concern about its adaptability, by its prospective users. Consequently, in providing this system, it is implied that some assurance will be given by the inventor that it will be compatible with the retained non purchasing systems. This claim will help assist in satisfying such a requirement.

Claim 19 CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "the finder" disclosed in Claim 19, line 3

Question: Who is the finder?

Amended Claim 19:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

A

Response: The finder in question is the person who "found" the changes per claim.

I propose replacing the entire claim:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request, to complete with explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

CLAIM 19 - CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "template forms", disclosed in Claim 19, line 5.

Amended Claim 19:

19. System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

Note: "template" is a commonly used word in electronics, which may be used to denote an electronic master original form available from which to secure electronic copies on the monitor. It is only used in this application to indicate the manner in which copies can be secured from the computer, for the convenience of the user, and not to subrogate the meaning of "forms" or work sheet for those contained herein. By its addition to the claim, the user gets better direction for sourcing it from a menu.

It does not deserve identification as a new matter. If the Examiner continues to consider it "new matter", I authorize "template" to be cancelled.

Claim 29 CLARIFICATION OF NEW MATTERS

Subject: "Amended Claim 29, "Purchase Menu secured on the originator's monitor, and assigned purchase key"

29. System as defined in claim 17. wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of information and action links, including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders, accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

Proposed acceptance of present form in substance for the following reasons, with modifications made to serve needs found in Subject Matter and Differences Sections, as included here..

The inclusion of Purchase Menu, and its accompanying Purchase Key are extensions of descriptions found in the original Summary of the Invention.(Page 1, line 15, and Page 3, line 17)

"In the preparation stages of the order in the computer, use is made of a Purchase Resources Program available by using computer windows (Page 1, line 14), and "requires greater attention to the justification for the items order..... and be made a more identifiable supplement to the Purchase Document and the Purchase Worksheet for either fixed assets or expense items" (Page 3, lines 19-22). In addition, nine forms are displayed in the application, with identification of 16 reports.. Use of windows in the system implies existence of a menu to access these and other information needed by the user.

Such a menu should only be patentable as referenced to its special contents, and the nature of the One Page System is sufficiently different in content to recognize it for inclusion in the application and claim. The value of the Purchase Menu and its implication is substantial and warrant protection in the form of a claim.

Claim 29 Clarification of New Matters - continued

Proposed change:

System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu" secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection, such as company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided by the purchasing department.

**CLAIMS FOUND TO NOT HAVING POSSESSION OF CLAIMED INVENTION
UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112**

Claim 17, rejected by virtue of being a new matter under 35 U.S.C. 112.

Note: Upon satisfaction of the four new matter items in Claim 17, this would not be a new matter.

Claim 18-30, rejected by dependency on rejected Claim 17.

Note: Upon satisfaction of Claim 17, this form of rejection for Claims 18-30, would also be satisfied

**CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER
UNDER 35U.S.C. 112**

Claims identified by the Examiner as not meeting 35U.S.112 critieria.

Subject Matter	Claim
* Recites the limitations, "the finder"	Claim 19, line 3
* Recites the limitation "the dots"	Claim 19, line 4
* Recites the limitation "the auditing function"	Claim 21, line 4
** Recites "which is first processed"	Claim 19, line 3
** Recites "etc"	Claim 29, line 6
** Recites "the major sources for these data established by the purchasing department"	Claim 29, lines 8-9

* Insufficient antecedent basis

** Not clear

(See following pages for proposed changes)

CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER

Subject: "the finder" disclosed in Claim 19, line 3

Amended Claim 19:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

Response: The finder in question is the person who "found" the changes, per claim.

I propose replacing the entire claim:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request, to complete with explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER

Subject: "the dots" disclosed in Claim 19, line 4

Amended Claim 19:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

I propose replacing the entire claim:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle. thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request, to complete with explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

Claim 21, line 4 - Recites Limitation, "the auditing function"

Rejection on Insufficient antecedent basis.

21. System as defined in claim 17, wherein electronic signatures are required of purchaser's participating employees to acknowledge their actions completed, and will thus be shown to ease verification of the entire One Page document through its successive steps, and to assist the auditing functions.

The Security and Auditing Program found in the Computer Programs for the One Page Purchasing System of the Application lists fifteen programs designed for the auditors to find errors and misuse of the existing purchasing systems, and recognize deficiencies in the system. This process includes verifying the proper actions of those engaged in purchasing, which requires their using an electronic signature on the One Page document to indicate completion of their task and acknowledging the contents and prices shown.

The auditor by working with one document, can quickly check that all participants are accounted for, in his verification, and they are all committed to the same items and costs shown in one document, which replaces the usual checking of a number of documents for one purchase order.

I suggest this total replacement::

System as defined in claim 17, wherein electronic signatures on the One Page document are required of those employees engaged in purchasing, to acknowledge their assigned actions completed, which, by using the One Page document, easily permits verification of their actions completed, by others, including auditors checking for prescribed conformance in the purchasing system.

CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER

Subject: "What does "which" refer to?

Amended Claim 19:- line 3

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

I propose replacing the entire claim:

System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request, to complete with explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER

Subject: Claim 29, line 6 recites, " tc" - Not clear what additional information is involved, and if additional information is required?

29. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of information and action links, including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders, accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

Proposed change:

System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu" secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection, such as company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided by the purchasing department.

CLAIMS FOUND TO BE INDEFINITE IN COVERING SUBJECT MATTER

Subject: Claim 29, lines 8-9, Need definition of major sources for data established by the Purchasing Department.

29. System as defined in claim 17. wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of information and action links, including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders, accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

Proposed change:

System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu" secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection, such as company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided by the purchasing department.

ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM
INDEX FOR NON OBVIOUS APPROVAL

	Page No.
Prima Facie Considerations	19
A New Product	20-23
A Useful Product	24-25
A Non Obvious Product – Summary	26-27
Combinations of Groups	28-29
Scope and Content	30-34
Consensus of Four Groups (A-D)	35
Group A (Claims 17,20,24,27,28)	36-62
1. Consensus	36-42
2. Obviousness Differences	43-62
(by claims)	
Group B (Claims 18,19,26)	63-70
1. Consensus	63-64
2. Obviousness Differences	65-68
(by claims)	
Group C (Claims 21,22,23,25)	69-77
1. Consensus	69-70
2. Obviousness Differences	71-77
(by claims)	
Group D (Claims 29,30)	78-83
1. Consensus	78-79
2. Obviousness Differences	80-83
(by claims)	
Appendix	
One Page Purchasing System – Abstract	84
Claims	85-88
References in Patents	89-91
Wiecha	92-102
Thomson	103-110
Josephson	111-115
Johnson	116-123
Ivanov	124-129
Walker	130-136
Barnes	137-145

NON OBVIOUS APPROVAL

PRIMA FACIE CONSIDERATIONS

The decisions faced by patent examiners are recognized as being vastly complicated and subjected to judgments on such a variety of subjects, along with shortages of time and pressures for performance, that it is only reasonable to bring to the attention of the Examiner, elements of an invention and its claims which may have been overlooked or not given sufficient consideration to non obviousness, such as contained in this report.

Perhaps the combination of prior art isn't as obvious in its content, or the differences in ages of the patent filings would have had an adverse effect on the combined prior art at the time of the new invention. Can one really combine the knowledge retained by the hypothetical inventor, with an ingenuity for new applications and the readiness to exert efforts to achieve a new One Page Purchasing System, induced by unestablished motives, with any reasonable certainty of fairness to the invention and inventor in this question of obviousness? Then recognizing and resisting hindsight must be very difficult, as well as balancing the goals of obviousness vs. non obviousness in the Examiner's search...

The significance of the Examiner's judgmental decision is very critical. An adverse judgment can have a number of repercussions. One being that, if my invention isn't accepted, through previous public disclosures of its contents by the Patent Office publishing the Application, it will be quickly recognized and freely developed by others. I will lose all my years of effort, with the necessary opportunity for paybacks, and will not be physically and financially able to adapt to this situation. --all created by the Patent Office's practice of publication prior to approval.

I respectfully request that the Examiner carefully reexamine my application.

THE ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM – A NEW PRODUCT

developed by Harold F. Hynes, a management consultant for 40 years, with an M.S. Degree in Accounting from Columbia University. His Provisional Patent was applied for in September, 2000, followed by a Utility Patent Application in September 2001, for which 14 claims are now pending.

BASIC FUNCTIONS OF PURCHASING

An employee of an organization needs to procure a product not available in the organization and is authorized to purchase it elsewhere. About 38 steps follow from this need, as described in the attached Conventional Purchasing Functions, which may be performed manually or electronically.

Conventional forms used in these procedures include, purchase requisitions, purchase orders, vendor's confirmations, delivery advices, invoices, statements, and payment checks. Each form completed repeats much of the same basic information, but to be acted upon, must be read and verified to assure completeness, and matched to the contents of the previous documents. This entails seven different documents and eight points of verification, plus accounting and auditing procedures, which also require forms and verification. These forms are transmitted within the purchasing organization, and with the vendor and bank.

THE ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM has one page electronically replacing the seven documents, and by using it for all the functions, the eight verification steps are not necessary. A control system progressively acts to keep the system in motion, with a minimum of human participation. The basic system is claimed in 17a,b, and d, with refinements covered in other claims, including Claims, 20,24,27, and 28 (see Abstract in Appendix and supporting workflows in Application)

The One Page System is believed to be an entirely new concept, combining all the 38 purchasing functions listed in the following page. Newness is recognized by the

Examiner failing to find a single invention in the patent search which parallels the One Page System, and no report has been received from the Patent Office that a disclaimer has been received, resulting from their publication of the Application on March 6, 2003

Despite the important contribution it will have when introduced, there are several probable reasons why others haven't produced a similar system. One is the easy, present profitable diversifying opportunities for new development in the product selection , or procurement side of purchase requisitions, with new electronic uses of catalogs and a vast selection of sources. These offer relatively simple, quick advancements, recognized by many which in itself discourages other directions. A March 11, 2002 article in Information Week, "E Procurement Apps Hook Onto the Supply Chain" reports "that businesses today are extending E Procurement beyond controlling the purchase of office and goods for maintenance and repair, to reap its benefits in the direct goods area" This suggests that the purchasing industry is still in the early growing stages, and not thinking about a total One Page Purchasing System. Eight of the major companies reported in the article are still in this infancy.

Another reason is that the One Page System engulfs three partners: purchaser, vendor, and the bank. Each depends on the others for participation to be successful with the system, with adjustments necessary by all three, and each can be hesitating to think about another new expensive process at this cost level, dependent on others..

A third reason is that such a product would only be applicable to large organizations at present, for maximum benefit and their thoughts have been blinded by the sizeable procurement possibilities now in evidence.

Motivation for such a system can be prevented from hatching by the great competitive interest shown in the procurement direction over the past several years and the breadth of the necessary applications for the one Page System may not be in the realm of their suppositions.

The time is now ripe for the One Page Purchasing System to be introduced, with the approval of its Application.

CONVENTIONAL PURCHASING FUNCTIONS

For each item (s) ordered:

1. Introduce purchasing policies and procedures including security and scheduling controls.
2. Establish need
3. Meet company objectives
4. Assure money available
5. Secure preliminary approval
6. Determine:
 - a. Right item
 - b. Right Quantity
 - c. Right quality
 - d. Right price
 - e. Right timing
 - f. Right warranties
 - g. Right credit terms
 - h. Right source.
7. Prepare purchase requisition
8. Secure final approval
9. Prepare purchase order
10. Send purchase order to vendor
11. Vendor prepares processing documents
12. Vendor prepares and sends confirmation
13. Purchaser receives confirmation and compares to purchase order
14. Purchaser sets up follow up date
15. Vendor prepares shipping document
16. Vendor sends item with shipping document
17. Purchaser receives item and shipping document
18. Purchaser compares item with shipping document
19. Purchaser receiving department sends item to user
20. User checks item to purchase order
21. User approves purchase for payment
22. Vendor prepares and sends invoice
23. Purchaser compares invoice to purchase order
24. Purchaser checks invoice calculations
25. Purchaser sets up accounting entries
26. Vendor prepares and sends monthly statement
27. Purchaser receives statement and compares charges to invoices
28. Purchaser sets up accounting entries for payment
29. Purchaser prepares and sends payment check to vendor
30. Vendor makes accounting entries
31. Vendor's bank receives check for clearing, making entries
32. Purchaser makes necessary disposition of any items replaced
33. Fixed assets are numbered, and listed
34. Depreciation of any fixed assets replaced, is processed.
35. Depreciation is set up for new fixed asset items.
36. Purchase documents are filed
37. Purchase documents are destroyed when scheduled.
38. Audit systems are introduced

Harold F. Hynes

THE ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM - A USEFUL PRODUCT!

One doesn't need a study to know that purchases of goods worldwide by businesses and governments each year are in the trillions of dollars, with a major segment by large organizations. The Federal Government accounts for more than \$200 billion, with 300,000 suppliers.

A study by an industry research firm, International Data Corporation has predicted a market of \$16 billion for procurement software by 2005

These needs are dictated by manual and electronic applications of most of the 38 purchasing functions, listed previously, for purposes of good management and financial controls, including auditing needs. Processing costs of an order range up to \$200.

Given this market, it is important that every opportunity be taken to reduce the unwelcome, but necessary cost of the functions shown. As better electronic systems and procedures are developed, substantial time and cost savings can be introduced. This is the market available to the One Page Purchasing System.

Any system to eliminate forms and processes and simplify systems would be a welcome assistance in reducing costs as represented in the attached benefits, achievable by use of the One Page Purchasing System. These benefits are secured by elimination of documents, with the resulting discontinuance of repetitive verifications of documents, along with improved electronic procedures.

The benefits chart shows the great number to be realized by the One Page Purchasing System and the insignificant number of benefits to be achieved by the representative group of seven patents used to demonstrate obviousness over the One Page System.

It is evident by this comparison that the obviousness is not demonstrated by the comparative benefits of the two entities, and favors approval of this application..

COMPARISON OF PROFITABLE FEATURES OF ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM WITH PATENTS CITED BY US.

PURCHASER

- (x) Eliminates processing small orders through the purchasing department
 - (x) Eliminates handling and mailing of purchase orders to the vendor
 - (x) Eliminates verifying confirmation of orders to the purchase order
 - (x) Eliminates receipt and handling of vendor's invoice
 - (x) Eliminates the need to compare invoice to the purchase order
 - (x) Eliminates the need to compare items received to the invoice
 - (x) Eliminates the need to compare invoiced prices and additions to the purchase order.

VENDORS

- (x) Electronically uses the Purchase Document to set up their production shipping requirements.
 - (x) Eliminates need to prepare a confirmation of the order.
 - (x) Eliminates preparation and handling an invoice.
 - (x) Eliminates preparation and handling of a statement
 - (x) Eliminates preparation and handling of a shipping document.
 - (x) Relies on payment schedule agreed upon with purchaser.
 - (x) Eliminates receipt and processing of payments.
 - (x) Speeds up receipt of payment in bank account.
 - (x) Receives a record of invoices paid from the purchaser.
 - (x) Automatically records sales, billing and payments from purchase documents, shipments, and payments.

THE BANK

- (x) Eliminates the need for processing purchaser's checks
 - (x) Secures compensating balance for processing payments or fee.
 - (x) Automatically secures funds to maintain balances needed.
 - (x) Has possibility of securing accounts from vendors

ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM - A NON OBVIOUS PRODUCT SUMMARY

Claims rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 have been cited by the Examiner as applicable to Claim Numbers 17-30 of Patent Application No. 09/945,467 due to obviousness, and are appealed by this document and its supporting data.

Rejection is based on the suppositions of seven patents issued respectively to Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, Johnsson, Ivanov, Walker, and Barnes, which the Examiner found to have sufficient evidence of existing prior art and the ordinary skills of an artisan to envision a One Page Purchasing System.

The Examiner in reaching this conclusion has employed groupings of these patents to substantiate particular phases of the One Page System, and in the Detailed Action Report has designated specific portions of each of the seven patents as references to these phases.

The basic premise of the One Page System found in Claim 17 is confined to rejections from four patents, as a combination.. Strong support for the non obvious position of the One Page Purchasing System can be secured by referring to the combination of four patents, as representing plausible reasons for rejection on the basis of obviousness. The absence of any one patent to position itself against the One Page System deems it necessary to introduce a substantial degree of subjective obviousness conclusions, which weakens the quality of the decision for obviousness. A careful review of the individual patents reveals that one of the four doesn't remotely recognize the subject of purchasing and related systems. Two others, instead of representing the purchasing organization, represent the seller, and confine their direction to the manner in which monies are collected from the purchaser. One patent remains, which is principally setting up an electronic catalog system to assist the buyer in making selections, and collects these data to a point of preparing a purchase order. This offers no evidence of fulfilling the many functions listed here, and provided by the One Page Purchasing System, by combining individual resources drawn from each patent.. Failure to find

sufficient evidence of relationship to the One Page System, on the basis of an incomplete combination of four patents negates the quality of any prior art and doesn't portend the existence of any form of related skills.

Responses to both the results of patent combinations and specific portions, are contained in the following sections of this report.

It is believed that upon further review, the Examiner will find sufficient reasons for the claims to be non obvious.

USE OF COMBINATIONS OF PATENTS FOR PROVING OBVIOUSNESS

The Examiner has used combinations of these various patents cited for obviousness, grouped progressively into four groups, with a total consensus from contributions by all four groups, to be derived and considered for obviousness.

Ref.	Group	Claims	Inventors Cited
..11	A	17,20,24,27,28	Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, Ivanov
12	B	18,19,26	Add Johnson
13	C	21,22,23,25	Delete Johnson, Add Walker
14	D	29.,30	Delete Walker, Add Barnes

Inventor	Patent	Filed
Wiecha	5,870,717	1995
Thomson	5,121,945	1990
Josephson	4,974,878	1988
Johnson	6,023,683	1994
Ivanov	5,706,452	1998
Walker	5,794,207	1996
Barnes	5,970,475	1997

A consensus of all four groups is presented, followed by individual groups being reported. Each of these groups is reviewed here in conjunction with individual patents cited as having specific contents in support of the total group's position on obviousness. The individual group initially has a description of the patents claimed to cause rejection, which is followed by the Examiner's statement supporting obviousness, with the applicant's response.

None of the above groups show sufficient evidence to support obviousness. (See following groups).

NON OBVIOUSNESS - CONSENSUS OF FOUR GROUPS
AND CLAIMS BY GROUPS --

Group	Claim	Subject
A	17	One Page Document replacing 7 forms and 8 verifications with Electronic system, worksheet, and direct payment to vendor's bank.
	20	Use of vendor's invoice number to acknowledge One Page Order
	24	Use of bar code on delivery package to identify One Page for check off
	27	Allows vendor to stop using own documents eliminated with One Page.
	28	Provides back up worksheet for order justification, accounting & taxes
B	18	Gives selection for type of One Page by dollar size and/or contract
	19	Provides procedure for handling changes necessary for One Page
	26	Places amounts and accounts to be charged, on One Page
C	21	Uses electronic signatures by purchaser employees for convenience in acknowledging action taken.
	22	Requires total cost of One Page, to expedite payment to bank
	23	Prearranges automatic payment schedule, with vendor
	25	Purchaser receiving department, uses hand held computer to check items to One Page.
	29	Uses purchase menu to link order originator to necessary sources.
D	30	Identifies 17 management reports.

(See complete file of claims in Appendix)

COMPARISON OF ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM WITH COMPOSITE GROUPS OF SEVEN CITED PATENTS AND INDIVIDUAL PATENTS

Scope and Content

The U.S. Patent Office has rejected my patent application entitled One Page Purchasing System No.09/945,467, for Obviousness, although the Detailed Action Report states that its claims are pending..With recognition that evaluating Obviousness has always tended to be a very subjective determination, it is respectfully requested that this rejection decision be reversed, based on a new perspective of the facts relating to this decision, as described here.

35U.S.C. 103(a) forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this office action:

(a) "A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the difference between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains,. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made".

The subject matter has been divulged as claims in amendments 17-30 filed on February 6, 03, and upon either proposed minor modifications being accepted or cancellation for newness items, presently requested for clarification, is the basis for considering Obviousness. These newness items are not tantamount to the Obviousness decision.

Evidence of related prior art and ordinary skills of the art has been chosen by the Examiner from millions of existing patents, subject to the best forms of search, resulting in the selection of seven patents.

In this search, no other patent, nor these seven patents have been found to describe a One Page Purchasing System. Reliance in judging Obviousness is therefore

placed on these seven to exhibit certain characteristics which conform to similar ones in the One Page Purchasing System, or from which one can draw conclusions of Obviousness. The Examiner, in the absence of any one patent's adequacy of similarity, notes the need to consider combined packages of all seven patents to find sufficient evidence of Obviousness. Examples of possible similarities between each of the seven and the One Page System are also cited to display their contribution to these packages, envisioned as one hypothetical person, presenting all their best combined ordinary skills.

The Examiner, in presenting the Detailed Action, has identified individual inventions and selected groups of these inventors as teaching the context of specific claims in the one page system. An examination of these areas of teaching fails to disclose the existence and merits of such teaching, as confirmed by my responses to specific forms of comparison, contained in this report.

The subsequent section of this report matches the structure of the Examiner's "Detailed Action", containing a review of the four groups, with a consensus of all four, followed by a consensus of each group, and then individually with each claim within each group. The subjects identified by the Examiner are exemplified by quoting the One Page System's claims, and are followed by a "Response" in the case of the group, and by "Differences" for the claims. Each group is prefaced with a brief description of the patents referred to in the group, for purposes of identification with the subject. Claims reported include a copy of the appropriate claim.

CONSENSUS OF FOUR GROUPS (A-D) OF CLAIMS, COMPARING COMPONENTS AND BENEFITS OF ONE PAGE SYSTEM AND EXAMINER'S FINDINGS

The Examiner's apparent objective in devising groups of claims is to demonstrate the best representation of potential purchasing functions comparatively found to be predominate in the contents of the patents and the One Page Purchasing System, in positioning obviousness..

Reasons for the Examiner's choice of claims, as shown in the attached, selected to represent each of these groups to establish a consensus of total findings for the seven patents, couldn't be found in the Detailed Action Report.

Groupings could be on several values, degree of obviousness, significance of subjects, creditability of claims, relationships of functions, and forms of application. Having a total system to consider, it isn't apparent that any portion of it can be signaled as a separate entity.

An analysis of the groups, using 7 patents for evaluation, reveals that four patents, with their inventors are predominant in contributing to all the prognostic concepts associated with the 14 claims. Of the remaining three, Johnson might be considered in contributing from his participation in Claims 18 and 19. In 18 his input of having three different groups of orders was found to be a different type of orders than used by the One Page. His interest in processing changes only applied to the in house changes when preparing a requisition.. Walker entered with Claims 21-23,25, using an agent's service to help find a seller for a guaranteed buyer, and his entry on electronic signatures, total amounts shown on the order, prearranging payment, and use of a hand held computer, were made invalid for obviousness, with being an agent for a qualified buyer. Barnes is excluded as representing just another form of electronic menu, for Claim 29. With these

lacking in qualifications, we have the 14 claims to be the background for consideration of prior art and ordinary skills by the remaining four inventors

The remaining four were represented by including one patent which doesn't remotely recognize the subject of purchasing, (Ivanov) and two others instead of representing the purchasing organization, represent the seller (Thomson and Josephson). This leaves Wiecha who's patent is principally setting up an electronic catalog system to make selections. So, one person distantly tied to purchasing remains to represent the four groups of claims. This does not support the objective of the Examiner in advancing the theory that there would be sufficient breadth of vision from a consensus to serve in establishing obviousness for the One Page Purchasing System..

A review of obviousness references cited by the Examiner, listed on pages 90-91, in the Appendix, shows that of the 20 One Page Purchasing System's subjects, reported as obvious, 17 of these were cited to only a single person, with three referred to two persons by the Examiner. This demonstrates the very limited composite producing experience of each of the seven inventors available to be cited, which defeats the possibility of an existence of a hypothetical person having sufficient ordinary skills, claimed by the Examiner, particularly when their own individual patents are found to be non obvious.

In engineering the hypothetical person to adopt the inklings of thought which might have prevailed upon the seven inventors as permeated by their patents, we could trace the steps offered by the Examiner, reviewing 14 claims., using the list of functions of purchasing, proposed to be used by the One Page Purchasing System..

Ultimately the conclusion rests with the findings that the cited systems fail to produce the elimination of seven forms and eight verifications, and a great amount of Visualization would be necessary to support obviousness of the One Page Purchasing System.

However, it is felt that the above discovery of a lack of benefits from pooling the four Group precludes the necessity for further comparisons on this basis, and the comparisons with each Group will be continued in the following sections.

Addendum:

The Examiner captures the strengths of two of the patents in getting the One Page System process off the ground by recognizing the existence of the preliminary steps of finding the resources necessary to place an order. These steps, although necessary as a forerunner in the One Page System are just recognized as a common component to be secured through the use of "off the shelf" systems, of which there are many, and are not evidenced by a claim. This initial level of the system with 38 steps, with which to cope, doesn't act to replace seven forms and eliminate eight verifications, in offering obviousness, which needs reaching a far greater depth of perception to achieve this obviousness, in visualization..

NON OBVIOUSNESS - CONSENSUS OF FOUR GROUPS

AND CLAIMS BY GROUPS --

Group	Claim	Subject
A	17	One Page Document replacing 7 forms and 8 verifications with Electronic system, worksheet, and direct payment to vendor's bank.
	20	Use of vendor's invoice number to acknowledge One Page Order
	24	Use of bar code on delivery package to identify One Page for check off
	27	Allows vendor to stop using own documents eliminated with One Page.
	28	Provides back up worksheet for order justification, accounting & taxes
B	18	Gives selection for type of One Page by dollar size and/or contract
	19	Provides procedure for handling changes necessary for One Page
	26	Places amounts and accounts to be charged, on One Page
C	21	Uses electronic signatures by purchaser employees for convenience in acknowledging action taken.
	22	Requires total cost of One Page, to expedite payment to bank
	23	Pearranges automatic payment schedule, with vendor
	25	Purchaser receiving department. uses hand held computer to check items to One Page.
	29	Uses purchase menu to link order originator to necessary sources.
D	30	Identifies 17 management reports.

(See complete file of claims in Appendix)

GROUP A – CLAIMS 17,20,24,27,28

Appeal of Newly added Claims 17,20,24,27,28 Rejected Under 35 USC 103a, for Obviousness Over Wiecha, Patent No. U.S. 5,870,717, in View of Thomson, et. Al. Patent No. U.S. 5,121,945, Josephson, U.S. Patent No. 4974,878, and Ivanov, U.S. Patent No. 5,707,452.

The following describes the four patents selected by the Examiner to support obviousness for Group A:

WiECHA'S PATENT, filed 1995, entitled, "System for Ordering Items over Computer Network, Using an Electronic Catalog" creates a catalog enabling an employee to select an item from their catalog, and sets up a purchase order, which is electronically sent to the vendor.

THOMSON'S PATENT filed 1990, entitled "Financial Data Processing System" is designed for the vendor's use, instead of the purchaser's, to encourage the purchaser to pay promptly, sends the purchaser a two part invoice, attaching a blank check to be signed for the amount due and mailed back to the vendor, or the vendor's bank.

JOSEPHSON'S PATENT, filed 1998, entitled "Financial Data Processing System, Using Installment Payment Coupons" is designed for a creditor's use, instead of the purchaser's, whereby the creditor uses it to facilitate payment from the debtor by including a draft form in the coupon for the debtor to sign, authorizing automatic withdrawals from the debtor's bank account, and mailing it back to the creditor or creditor's bank.

IVANOV'S PATENT, entitled, "Method and Apparatus for Structuring and Managing the Participatory Evaluation of Documents by a Plurality of Reviewers" is designed to secure independent, simultaneous evaluations of projects, by Email from a number of reviewer using documents received from a data base , controlled by a workflow manager

REJECTION OF CLAIM 17 IN DETAILED ACTION;

IN the following, the Examiner repeats the same language used in the One Page Purchasing claims, thereby assuming identical performance.

11(C) EXAMINER identifies that Wiecha's system "teaches an Electronic Commerce System for procuring good/services by a number of user within an organization, from a number of vendors"

RESPONSE: This is a preface introduction which is not sufficient in substance to warrant obviousness, for rejection purposes.

EXAMINER identifies that Wiecha's system comprises a document traveling electronically between participants of the system

RESPONSE; Wiecha's document is just a purchase order, sent one way to the vendor, and not the composite One Page being judged, which travels in many directions, serving many functions.

. EXAMINER identifies that Wiecha's system introduces each One Page document to the system of serving these purchasing functions, progressively moving the document to the participants , following each step or tracking actions completed, verifications completed, action needed, and sending or forwarding the document to the next action location, with a follow up or tracking system.

RESPONSE: Wiecha's above document has been favored by now being called a One Page document, which is incorrect, along with implying the purchase order's myriad of functions. Wiecha's system stops at number 9 in the Functions Chart, although all of the remaining 38 significant steps would have to be continued, but his patent doesn't provide for this continuation. The One Page Purchasing System now being judged, does provide for all of these steps. Representation of a purchase order to fill all the replacements of seven documents and eight verifications is not possible and is not made part of Wiecha's patent, nor is there any reference found, which suggests such a possibility.

The Examiner recognizes that Wiecha fails to explicitly disclose a one page electronic purchasing document which collectively replaces individual paper and electronic purchase requisition, purchase order and vendors, acknowledgments, shipping notices, invoices, and statements and successively serves their identical functions. There is no evidence to consider "fails to explicitly". The possibility is not there, therefore, there is no substance to support obviousness from these identifications.

(Also see 17 a and b,Differences)

EXAMINER identifies Wiecha's worksheet selected by the purchase originator when securing and preparing the document, to disclose justification of the purchase, possible supporting data, and in the case of contract orders, information on contract dates, purchases to date and past performance.

RESPONSE: The Examiner fails to explicitly disclose a One Page template worksheet. No evidence or reference to a worksheet could be found in the specific references cited in the Detailed Action Report. These facts dismiss the rejection for obviousness applicable to a worksheet (see 17 c) Differences..

EXAMINER identifies Wiecha's use of a plurality of terminals, work stations, servers, Intranet and Internet programs operating with "off the shelf" software systems chosen from selections current at the time of installing the One Page System, compatible with retained legacy systems.necessary to operate the One Page System

RESPONSE: No such flexibility in the One Page Purchasing System's selection of programs as described above, was found to be contained in Wiecha's patent, thereby not justifying this Claim's function to be considered obvious.

EXAMINER S identifies Thomson teaching a one page electronic purchasing document or single, integrated multi-functional document , which collectively replaces individual paper and electronic purchase requisition, purchase orders and vendors: acknowledgements, shipping notices, invoices, and statements: and successively serves their identical functions.

RESPONSE: Thomson's patent to provide the vendor with a collection procedure is completely out of the realm of a One Page Purchasing System designed for the purchaser, and offers no suggestion for any relationship between the two systems to establish obviousness.

EXAMINER'S reference to the obviousness of one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the Electronic Commerce System of Wiecha to include a one page, with replacing 7 documents eliminating 8 verification steps as taught by Thomson, and motivated by the benefits, would receive a high level of acceptance and widespread use.

RESPONSE: Wiecha's patent is so limited in substance to match the One Page Purchasing System that it would require a complete new system rather than modification of his existing system. Thomson's system designed for the vendor doesn't have the slightest relationship to serving the needs of the purchaser. Consequently, with no basis for comparability of systems, no skills would have been evident to exhibit Thomson's application to a One Page Purchasing System.

EXAMINER identifies Josephson's patent and teaching activated by the operation of the One Page document, arranging payment to the vendor's bank, without individual participation within the purchaser's organization and a system that is coupled with a time schedule for each action.

RESPONSE: Josephson's teaching apply to installment payment systems pertinent to the creditor's use in collections from the debtor. Coupon payments, using individual participation, may be mailed to the creditor or to the creditor's lock box.. His system is completely unrelated to the One Page System which controls payment by the purchaser electronically, and uses no installment system, thereby having no basis for obviousness..

EXAMINER recognizes the obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to modify the collective teachings of Wiecha and Thomson to include a payment system as taught by Josephson.

REONSE: With the failure of combined modifications of inventions of Wiecha and Thomson, it is evident that there is no base on which to add Josephson's skills, and Josephson's patent doesn't exhibit any One Page Purchasing relationship to establish obviousness, even if Wiecha and Thomson patents were recognizable.

EXAMINER identifies Ivanov's teaching of template worksheets, or template forms.

RESPONSE: Ivanov's system to evaluate projects unrelated to purchasing systems, does not contain any references which might be construed as associating with the One Page Purchasing System, and offers no reason for obviousness.

EXAMINER concludes that with the modifications of teachings of Wiecha, Thomson and Josephson, and worksheet or forms teaching of Ivanov, an obvious skill in the art would exist.

RESPONSE: Failure of Ivanov's patent to show evidence of obviousness rejects the possibility of adding his skills to Wiecha, Thomson and Josephson, which also have no evidence of obviousness.

GENERAL RESPONSE TO REJECTIONS OF CLAIM 17, FOR OBVIOUSNESS.

The above responses have presented sufficient reasons to establish that Claim 17 should be approved as non obvious.

EXAMINER, for Claim 20, combines the teaching of the above four inventors, as exhibited by their patents related to Claim 17, and adds a feature of acknowledging the

order by inserting the vendor's invoice number in the One Page Document and Emailing it back to the purchaser's system, as provided by Weicha.

RESPONSE: Failure to find adequate support for rejection of Claim 17 disclaims the opportunity to have a basis on which to add this new feature of an invoice number, represented by Weicha. Consideration of this new feature on its own merits results in finding that his system refers to billing, (invoicing) Wiecha, Col 12, line 18, by the vendor which is the practice the One Page System eliminates with use of the invoice number. Consequently, there is no basis for obviousness, in Claim 20.

EXAMINER continues to build on the above structure in Claim 24 by adding a bar code label outside of the order shipped, displaying the purchase document and invoice numbers, which will be used by the receiver to identify the One Page document for verification of a receipt, thereby eliminating the usual shipping document. – referenced to Thomson.

RESPONSE: The above disclaimers prevent use of previous hypothetical prior art as a bases upon which to structure this system found in Claim 24. Consideration of this new feature on its own merits, reveals that Thomson's patent and prior art contributions are limited to the vendor sending a combined invoice and blank check to be signed by purchaser, with no evidence of obviousness in Claim 24.

EXAMINER continues to build on the above structure in Claim 27, by permitting to put a "stop" on the preparation and processing of their documents replaced by the system, but continuing the use of the invoice number as identified with the One Page document, thereby saving substantial work and cost for the vendor – referenced to Josephson.

RESPONSE: The above disclaimers prevent use of previous hypothetical prior art as a bases upon which to structure the system found in Claim 27. Consideration of this new feature on its own merits reveals that Josephson's patent and prior art contributions refer to a "stop" payment created by the debtor after payment was sent to the creditor, which can't be readily matched against the One Page system of having the vendor conveniently "stop" their process of sending invoices to the purchaser. There is no evidence of obviousness for Claim 27.

EXAMINER further builds on the above structure with Claim 28 wherein a Purchase Worksheet provides a choice for either fixed assets or expenses applicable to larger

purchases which justify the purchase, and provide information on use of items r placed, depreciation reserves, writeoffs, other purchases required, etc., with this work sheet made an addition to the One Page document for internal use and fitted into a program for "other purchase actions" such as accounting and taxes, along with its use for auditing the One Page System. – referenced to Wiecha

RESPONSE: Three of the four items referenced by the Examiner as supporting obviousness describe the operations of an electronic catalog, with its pricing system, and one item describes the possibilities of making changes in purchase orders. These are not compatible with the One Page Purchasing Worksheet and have no representation for obviousness pf Claim 28..

NOTE; This completes the support of non obviousness for Group A, covering Claims 17,20,24,27-28 under 35 U.S.C 103(a), with the conclusion that all of these claims should be accepted as non obvious, the prior art is not evident and the lack of prior art does not allow sufficient awareness of ordinary skills

Differences Between Rejection Sources and Claims

Group A (Claims:17, 20,24,27,28)

Claim 17 Use of "preface" requires no comparison. No obviousness.

Claim 17(a) Difference in content – purchase order vs. total purchasing system.

Six unrelated subjects.

No obviousness.

Claim 17(b) One difference in content.

Five unrelated subjects

No. obviousness.

Claim 17(c) Six unrelated subjects

No obviousness.

Claim 17(d) Three unrelated subjects

No obviousness.

Claim 17(e) Two differences in content

No obviousness.

Claim 17(f) Difference in content – purchase order vs. full purchase system

Two unrelated subjects.

No obviousness

Claim 20 Six unrelated subjects

No obviousness.

Claim 24 Three unrelated subjects

No obviousness

Claim 27 Three unrelated subjects

No. obviousness

Claim 28 Five unrelated subjects

No obviousness

Combination – No obviousness.

(see supporting claims)

**CLAIM 17 DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

I CLAIM:

17. Electronic Commerce System for procuring goods/services by a number of users within an organization, from a number of vendors, (comprising) (changing to "consisting of"):

Note: The above wording "Electronic Commerce System for procuring goods/services by a number of users within an organization, from a number of vendors" is cited by the Examiner for obviousness rejection from Wiecha: Fig. 6, Fig. 7, Col. 3, lines 54-61 This wording constitutes a preface to six supporting functions, (Claims 17a –17f) combined to represent Claim 17, continuing with 13 related claims in the application. (Claims 17-30), as amended.

Rejections by Wiecha related to the above preface will be described below:

Fig. 6 is described by Wiecha as an invention topological overview., and shows a workflow of the parts of providing a catalog for viewing items and making the selection. Difference; the preface referred to constitutes no unique invention, or claim per se, and the matching with Fig. 6 has no significance for obviousness testing.

Fig. 7 is described by Wiecha as providing an overview of data flow between logical servers.

Difference: See Fig 6 above. No obviousness

Col. 3, Lines 54-61 refers to the supplier side and the buyer side being brought together by means of a computer network and associated service offerings.

Difference See Fig. 6 above. Also Wiecha uses an associated service to coordinate the catalog services and the buyer-s seller arrangements on the purchase order . This is not part of the On Page Purchasing System. No obviousness ..

**CLAIM 17(a) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

- (a) one page electronic purchasing document which collectively replaces individual paper and electronic purchase requisitions, purchase orders and vendors' acknowledgements, shipping notices, invoices, and statements; and successively serves their identical functions, traveling electronically between participants of the system; and

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Wiecha: Col. 2, lines 12-19, Col. 7, lines 64-65, Col. 8, lines 8-21, Col. 9, lines 46-52

Thomson: Abstract, Col. 2, lines 56-67, Col. 4, lines 65 to Col. 5, line 4, Col. 16, line 65, to Col. 17, line 25.

Wiecha (also see claim 17)

Col. 2, lines 12-19: describes a computer system for processing a purchase order within the purchasing organization.

Difference: Claim 17(a) one page replaces six documents, including the purchase order traveling between the several one page participants at the purchaser's and vendor's locations to serve about 38 functions. No obviousness.

Col. 7, lines 64-65 refers only to software controlling a purchase order.

Difference: Claim 17 (a), software would apply to the full purchasing system.

Col. 8, lines 8-21: applies to a system for disk storage, holding catalogs, and browsing of catalogs, with workflow described for the purchase order before sending to vendor.

Difference: Claim 17(a) permits choice of sources and systems for identifying Purchasers to be made from sources. No obviousness

Claim 17(a) continued

Col. 9, lines 46-52: refers just to purchase order being forwarded to vendor.

Difference: Claim 17(a) replaces purchase order with a composite purchasing document thereby greatly extending the system cited. .No obviousness

Thomson (also see Claim 17)

Abstract: describes a payment system created by vendor to send a two part invoice to the purchaser, having a tear off specially prepared check form for the purchaser to sign and mailing back to the vendor, thereby voiding the necessity for the purchaser to prepare a check

Difference: Claim 17(a) has no such system, and this single benefit only fouls up the purchaser's usual payment system, and has a substantial cost for the vendor to tailor make these checks for each purchaser.- Non obvious.

Col. 2, line 56-67,extols the benefits of saving time, labor and errors and preserving the integrity of the bank check, with a high level of acceptance.

Difference: Claim 17(a) has no such system, with the purchaser losing control of the payment system for their own benefits,.and these benefits claimed are not evident.

No obviousness.

Col. 4 lines 65 to Col. 5, line 4.refers to a seller's system of processing stop payments, return items, and overpayments, through using readable codes. No obviousness

Difference: Claim 17(a) has no such system, as the purchaser is the sender of the check. and not the recipient. No obviousness.

Col. 16, line 65, to Col. 17, line 25 Describes the system of processing the check receipts by the vendor and the check printing program.

Difference: Claim 17(a) represents the sender rather than the receiver of the check, therefore a comparison has no significance No obviousness.

Claim 17(a) continued

Addendum:

Note that by the use of the one page system, the vendor is relieved of sending an invoice and other documents, with the payment being sent directly to his bank, without his participation, thereby having no necessity for such a system as cited.

**CLAIM 17(b) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

(b) an electronic purchaser's system to introduce each One Page document to the system of serving these purchasing functions, progressively moving the document to the participants, following each step to recognize actions completed, verifications completed, actions needed, and sending the document to the next action location, coupled with a time schedule for each action, and a follow up system;

Rejection Basis for obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Wiecha: Col. 7, lines 9-16, 40-45, Col. 12, lines 30-67, Col. 13, lines 26- to Col.14, line 2

Josephson: Col. 6, lines 66 to Col. 7, line 5, Col. 16, lines 24-28

Wiecha:

Col. 7, lines 9-16 describes operations of Catalog Daemon to update catalogs

Differences: Claim 17(b) is not confined to the operations of any specific catalog, allowing flexibility in the choice of systems for selecting items. No obviousness.

Col. 7, lines 4045 describes operations of Filemover system to move catalog data in the system.

Differences: Claim 17(b) is not confined to the operations of any specific file system, allowing flexibility in the choice of system. No. obviousness

Col. 12, lines 30-67 refers to printing reports and describes workflow of purchase requisition approval.

Differences: Claim 17(b) extends the purchasing actions to all the purchasing functions, with a follow up system, not just the purchase requisition order. No obviousness.

Claim 17 (b) continued

Col. 13 lines 26- to Col. 14, line 2 describes several routes for the purchase order depending on the actions required.

Differences: Claim 17(b) extends the purchasing actions to all the purchasing functions with a follow up system, and not just the purchase order. No obviousness.

Josephson

Col. 6, lines 67 to Col. 7, line 5 refers to installment payment book, with coupons authorizing payments to be cleared by debtor's bank, with substantial savings for the creditor.

Differences: Claim 17(b) does not apply to installment sales, and payments are made by Josephson's postal services. No obviousness

Col., lines 2428 lists contents of the installment system.

Differences: Claim 17(b) does not apply to installment sales and payments are made Electronically and not by postal service. No obviousness.

**CLAIM 17c DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

- (c) a One Page template worksheet selected by the purchase originator when securing and preparing the One Page document, to disclose justification of the purchase, possible supporting data, and in the case of contract orders, information on contract dates, purchases to date and past performance;

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

**Wiecha: Fig. 7, Item 132, Col. 4, lines 52-54, Col. 6, lines 29-34, Col. 7 lines 9-16,
Col. 10, lines 4-11,23-26**

**Ivanov: Col. 17, lines 50-51, Fig. 7F, Fig. 7G, Col. 8s6, lines 25-31, Col. 17, line 50
To Col. 18, line 21, Col. 25, lines 1-11, Col. 29, lines 66 to Col. 30, line 8**

Wiecha:

Fig. 7, Item 132 names a pricing system for catalog items

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase, No obviousness.

Col. 4, lines 52-54 refers to use of Daemon pricing system for updating prices and catalogs.

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase. No obviousness.

Col. 6, lines 29-34 refers to a Daemon system allowing service organization to view products and descriptions.

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase. No obviousness.

Col. 7, lines 9-16 Describes Daemon system to update electronic catalog and monitors channels for action objects.

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase. No obviousness.

Claim 17c continued

Col. 10, lines 4-11 refers to changes in purchase order details.

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase. No obviousness

Col. 10, lines 23-26 refers to a specific system of finding items in the electronic catalog.

Difference: Unrelated to a worksheet to justify purchase. No obviousness.

Ivanov

All the above references to Ivanov's patent can be condensed for evaluation of obviousness.

His patent is titled, "Method and apparatus for structuring and managing the participatory evaluation of documents by a plurality of reviewers" This would serve to evaluate the use and content of the One Page worksheet.

Difference: The distinction is between the evaluation function and the "use" function,

and the evaluation system per se would not replace the form's use for purchasing. No obviousness.

**CLAIM 17d – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

- (d) a purchaser's payment system activated by the operation of the One Page document, arranging payment to the vendor's bank, without individual participation within the purchaser's organization;

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (see Patents Section for citations)

Josephson: Abstract, Col. 5, lines 44-56, Col. 6, lines 29-45, 50-58, Col. 7, lines 61 Col. 16, lines 10-27, Col. 5, lines 5-42, Barnes: Col. 5, lines 5-42

Josephson:

Abstract: describes a vendor's installment payment system for sending debtor a coupon payment book having payment coupons permitting debtor to sign them as bank payment drafts and mailing back to vendor, thereby applying to debtor's account, vendor's bank account, and charging debtor's bank account.

Difference: This is the vendor's system for collection, Claim 17d is the purchaser's system for payment. Purchaser does not receive installment coupons.
Distinctly different, No obviousness.

Col. 5, lines 44-56 (see above)

Col. 6, lines 29-45 (see above)

Col. 7, lines 61-65 (see above)

Col. 16, lines 10-27 (see above)

Barnes

Col. 5, lines 5-42 is a brief description of each of the flow charts from Fig. 12 thru Fig 19. None of these descriptions specifically make reference to paying the vendor's bank.

Difference; Lack of references to bank payments in these descriptions. Barnes' system to pay the bank, requires individual participation in receiving an invoice, verifying its accuracy, and authorizing payment. – not necessary with the one page system. No obviousness.

**CLAIM 17(e) DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

(e) exclusive rights in the use of the forms contained herein, referred to as template forms, and to any other forms associated with the One Page Document; and

Note:"template" is a commonly used word to denote a master original form available from which to secure copies, and is only used in this claim to indicate the manner in which the copies can be secured from the computer, for the convenience of the user, and not to subrogate the meaning of "forms" for those contained herein."

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

**Ivanov: Fig. 7F, Fig. 7G, Col. 6, lines 25-31, Col. 17, lines 50 to Col. 18, line 21,
Col. 25, lines 1-11, Col. 29, lines 66 to Col. 30, line 8.**

all of the above references relate to the use of templates forms to conduct Ivanov's Evaluation system, referred to as "notification templates"which contain instructions and tests. These are transmitted simultaneously to the participants.

Differences: There is no similarity between the templates used by the One Page System and those used for Ivanov's evaluation system, No obviousness.

**CLAIM 17(f) – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

(f) use of a plurality of terminals, work stations, servers, Intranet and Internet programs operating with "off the shelf" software systems chosen from selections current at the time of installing the One Page System, compatible with retained legacy systems, necessary to operate the One Page System.

Note: This claim was presented to secure full recognition that prior electronic patented inventions, which claim use of existing software, soon lose their creditability due to newer software and equipment emerging, and this warrants declaring the pertinent use of selections current at the time of installing the newly invented system, compatible with retained legacy systems..

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Wiecha: Fig. 4, Fig. 6, Fig. 7, Abstract, Col. 1, lines 57 to Col. 2, Line37.

Fig. 4 shows a "client environment" with specific software applications designed for an electronic catalog system.

Difference: Claim 17(f) does not limit its system for sourcing items to purchase, and provides for a total one page purchasing system, including the sourcing function, which is not limited in selection. No obviousness.

Fig. 6 Shows an invention topological overview, using specific applications designed for an electronic catalog system.

Difference: (see Fig. 4. above) No obviousness

Fig. 7. Gives an Overview of Data Flow between logical servers using specific software applications designed for an electronic catalog system.

Difference: Claim 17(f) will use different software and applications designed solely For the On Page System. No obviousness.

CLAIM 17(f) continued

Abstract provides a summary of Wiecha's system for ordering items over computer network using an electronic catalog through an associated service.

Difference: Wiecha's system is confined to the ordering process and employs an associated service to perform this function. Claim 17(f) covers all the 38 functions of purchasing, and does not employ an associated service.
No obviousness.

Col. 1, lines 57 to Col. 2, line 37 discloses a system for ordering items through use of an electronic catalog, using specific software applications designed for Wiecha's system.

Difference: (See Fig. 7 above) No obviousness.

**CLAIM 20 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

20 . System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor acknowledges the order by inserting the vendor's invoice number in the One Page document, and Emailing it back to the purchaser's System, thereby avoiding any problems of the vendor not having a compatible electronic signature system.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for Citations)

**Wiecha: Col. 7, lines 10-16, Col. 9, lines 60-63, Col. 10, lines 38-44, Col. 12, lines 48-51
Col. 13, lines 9-11, Col. 15, lines 12-23.**

Col. 7, lines 1-16, refers to Daemon catalog for software, providing objects, prices, descriptions, with a File Mover.

Difference: No relationship is found in the above reference to use invoices or invoice numbers to acknowledge orders, as shown in Claim 20. No obviousness.

Col. 9, lines 60-63, refer to manually updating status of purchase order for possible changes. reported by vendors via fax, phone, or mail.

Differences: Wiecha's report on changes is unrelated to use of invoice number for Claim 20 use of an electronic response for acknowledging the order, No obviousness.

Col. 10, lines 38-44: refers to manually checking current status of purchase order by EDI messages.

**Difference : Claim 20 provides an automatic electronic system for checking status.
No obviousness.**

Claim 20 continued

Col. 12, lines 48-51, Refers to sending Email messages to approval person for action necessary on the purchase requisition.

Difference: Claim 20 doesn't relate to approvals of the purchase requisition phase of the One page document, but only to acknowledgement by the vendor by use of an invoice number. No obviousness.

Col. 13, lines 9-11 refers to approvers receiving Email notices of need to approve purchase requisitions.

Differences" Claim 20 doesn't relate to approval of the purchase requisition phase of the One Page document, but only to acknowledgement by the vendor. No obviousness.

Col. 15, lines 12-23, refers to purchasers sending purchase orders electronically, with vendors acknowledging by EDI messages.

Differences: This is not the simple process of a One Page Document being transmitted Interchangeably from one participant to another by clicking a forwarding dot on the document, with a number to acknowledge order receipt, and an electronic follow up system, as claimed for Wiecha.. Wiecha just provides a system for the requisition and purchase order, with manually produced Email communications and heavy concentration on a catalog system. No obviousness.

**CLAIM 24 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

24.. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor attaches a bar code label to the outside of the order shipped, displaying the purchase document and invoice numbers, which will be used by the receiver to identify the One Page document for verification of receipt, thereby eliminating the usual shipping document.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (see Patents Section for citations)

Thomson: Fig. 1a, Fig. 1b, Col. 15 lines 30 to Col. 16, line 10.

Fig. 1a displays a one page combination vendor's invoice and a blank check form to be signed by the purchaser and mailed back to the vendor, as payment.

Difference: This is completely unrelated to Claim 24 which processes a shipment using a bar code label to identify the shipment. No obviousness.

Fig. 1b displays the endorsement back on the blank check form to help in processing the check when it reaches the bank.

Difference: See difference above. No obviousness.

Col. 15, lines 30 to Col. 16, line 10. provides details of processing steps for Fig. 1a and Fig. 1b.

Difference – See difference above. No. obviousness

**CLAIM 27 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

27. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor is permitted to put a "stop" on the preparation and processing of their documents replaced by the system, but continuing the use of the invoice number as identified with the One Page document, thereby saving substantial work and cost for the vendor.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (see Patents Section for citations)

Josephson: Fig. 8, Col. 6, lines 50-58, Col. 12, lines 10-58

Fig. 8 refers to a stop payment of a check or draft payment to a creditor made by an installment loan customer.

Difference: Completely different from "stop" in Claim 27 which applies to all the vendor's purchasing forms which are no longer necessary. No obviousness.

Col. 6, lines 50-58 (same reference and difference as shown for Fig. 8.)

Col. 12, lines 158 (same reference and difference as shown for Fig. 8)

**CLAIM 28 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

28. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a Purchase Worksheet provides a choice for either fixed assets or expenses applicable to larger purchases which justify the purchase, and provides information on use of items replaced, depreciation reserves, writeoffs,, other purchases required, etc., with this worksheet made an addition to the One Page document for internal use and fitted into a program for "other purchase actions", such as accounting and taxes, along with its use for auditing the One Page System.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (see Patents Section for citations)

Wiesha:Fig. 7, Item 132, Col. 4., lines 52-54, Col. 6, lines 29-34, Col. 7, lines 9-16. Col. 10, lines 4-11, 23-26

Fig. 7, Item 132 provides an overview of data flow between logical servers for an electronic catalog system, with Item 132 having price information

Difference: A catalog service system has nothing to do with a Purchase Worksheet for fixed assets, or expenses.. No obviousness.

Col. 4, lines 52-54 refers to use of a Daemon pricing system,in Fig. 7 (see above)

**Difference: A catalog service system has nothing to do with a Purchase Worksheet.
No obviousness.**

Col. 6, lines 29-34 lists some of the responsibilities of the EPS operation staff.

**Difference: This catalog responsibility doesn't include the Purchase Worksheet.
No obviousness.**

CLAIM 28 continued

Col. 7, lines 9-16 describes services provided by Catalog Daemon, dealing with catalog data.

Difference: This catalog service is software as opposed to the existence of a purchase worksheet. No obviousness.

Col. 10, lines 4-11, 23-26 describes technical possibilities for making changes in purchase order.

Difference: Purchase orders, as such, have been replaced with the one page document, and making changes is provided for with an Action Change Request. Also, changes are not compatible here with a Purchase Worksheet. No obviousness.

GROUP B – CLAIMS 18, 19, 26

Appeal of Newly added Claims 18, 19, 26 Rejected Under 35 USC 103a for Obviousness Over Wiecha, U.S. Patent Number 5,870,717 in view of Thomson et al, U>S> Patent Number 5,121,945, Josephson, U.S. Patent Number 4,974, 878 , and Ivanov, U>S> Patent Number 5, 706, 452 as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Johnson et al, U>S> Patent Number 6, 023,683

JOHNSON'S PATENT , filed 1994, entitled Electronic Sourcing System and Method, is designed to assist the buyer in locating items to be purchased through use of catalogs referenced into the user's computer.

NOTE: In the following, the Examiner gives the particular inventor credit for the same functions as used in the One Page Purchasing claims, thereby assuming identical performance.

12. EXAMINER identifies Claim 18 as rejected, with Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson and Ivanov failing to explicitly disclose a system wherein a One Page document used to perform the functions of the system, is selected from a choice of three forms of purchasing, by size and type of purchase, and provides for the needs of the different participants, as prepared by the originator. Johnson teaches such a system.

RESPONSE: Johnson's system separates purchases into three groups 1. orders placed directly with supplier, 2, orders sent to distributors, and 3. orders drop shipped to the purchaser's customer. Claim 18 separates purchase "orders" into three groups: 1. large orders over a specified amount, 2, smaller orders under than amount, and 3. orders secured under contract with vendors. These are two distinctly different groupings and have no justification to be labeled obvious. Two other references by the Examiner were completely unrelated. (see Differences – Claim 18)

EXAMINER states that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time, to modify the collective teaching of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson and Ivanov

to include a choice of three forms of purchasing by size and type of purchases , as taught by Johnson, with unrelated references to creating an order list.. . .

RESPONSE: Previous teachings of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson and Ivanov have been disclaimed for obviousness, as responded to previously, and would not be qualified to accept Johnson's contribution to build obviousness. Johnson's system is not similar to the One Page Purchasing System, as indicated, and would not be considered obvious for Claim 18.

EXAMINER refers to Claim 19 relating to changes found necessary in an order, to be processed through use of an Action Change Request form, taught by Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, Ivanov and Johnson

RESPONSE: Previous teachings of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov have been disclaimed for obviousness, as responded to previously, and would not be qualified to accept Johnson's contribution to build obviousness. Johnson's system refers to changes made while originating a purchase requisition before completing a purchase order, and is not involved beyond this point. The One Page System is after the One Page document has been completed by the originator. These are serious differences in control. Obviousness is not apparent for Claim 19

EXAMINER refers to Claim 26 with Johnson teaching a system wherein a section is contained in the One Page Document for the originator to enter the amounts and accounts to be charged for the items purchased, which is entered into the system to be held in suspense until the item is received as acknowledged, and charged to that account(s), with an accounts payable entry

RESPONSE: Johnson, in his catalog system doesn't have a One Page Document as referred to in Claim 26, to enter the amounts and accounts to be charged. There is no possible reason for obviousness.

NOTE: This completes reporting on Group B, representing Claims 18, 19, and 26. None of these have been found to contain evidence of obviousness of prior art or sufficient exposure of ordinary skills related to these subjects.

Differences Between Rejection Sources and Claims

Group B (Claims: 18,19,26)

Claim 18 Examiner notes four patents failed to explicitly disclose comparison.

Non comparable selections of three forms of purchasing.

Two unrelated subjects.

No obviousness.

Claim 19 Two differences in content.

No obviousness.

Claim 26 One unrelated subject

One difference application

No obviousness

Combination No obviousness

(see supporting claims)

**CLAIM 18 – DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

18. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a One Page document used to perform the functions of the system, is selected from a choice of three forms of purchasing, by size and type of purchase, and provides for the needs of the different participants, as prepared by the originator.

(Examiner noted that Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson and Ivanov failed to explicitly disclose a program similar to the One Page System)

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Johnson: Col. 18, lines 55-67, Col. 15, lines 45-49, Col. 2, Line 46 to Col. 3, line 2

Johnson:

Col. 18, lines 55-67:refers to a system to separate purchase orders into three groups.

(1) orders placed directly with supplier, (2) orders sent to distributors and (3) orders drop shipped to the purchaser's customer.

Difference: Claim 18 separates purchase orders into three types, 1) large orders over a specified amount, (2 smaller order under that amount, and (3) orders secured under contract with vendors. Each requires a different form of treatment. (see samples of individual forms in Application) No. Obviousnes

Col. 15, lines 45-49 refers to a system of printing a purchase order and the process of transmitting the order by means of mail, fax or EDI.

Difference: Claim 18 refers to selection of forms of purchasing by large and small dollar size, or contract - No obviousness

Col. 2. line 46 to Col. 3, line 2, describes a system for sourcing product information, and transferring desired item to a requisition form.

Difference: Claim 18 selects a one page form for ordering by dollar size and if by contract; and does not source information or create a r quisition.-
No obviousness.

**CLAIM 19 – DIFFERENCE BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

19. System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed, by the finder, through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Sections for Citations)

Johnson: Col. 13, lines 28 to Col. 14, line 11, Col. 15, lines 60 to Col. 16, line 32

Col. 13, lines 28 to Col. 14, line 11. refers to changes to be made while originating a purchase requisition, before completion of a purchase order..

Difference: Claim 19 applies to changes to be made after the One Page document has been completed by the originator of the document and had left his control.

No obviousness

Col. 15, line 60 to Col. 16, line 32. Applies to changes already made in the order by the vendor, after receipt of the purchase order, reported electronically by the vendor to the purchaser on a speed message form, restricted to reporting only certain types of actions by the vendor. No obviousness

Difference: Claim 19 gets user's approval for changes, using the Action Change Request, before vendor can make any changes. Also, the Action Change Request is not limited in reporting types of causes for making changes, and it advises intervening participants about changes being requested.

No obviousness.

**CLAIM 26 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

26. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a section is contained in the One Page document for the originator to enter the amounts and accounts to be charged for the items purchased, which is entered into the system to be held in suspense until the item is received as acknowledged, and charged to that account(s) with an accounts payable entry.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Johnson: Col. 6, lines 39- to Col. 7, line 12, Col. 7, lines 51-60

Col. 6, lines 39 to Col. 7, line 12 describes the initiative of preparing a purchase requisition with necessary details for checking the inventory sources.

Difference: This is completely different from Claim 26 which enters the amounts and accounts to be charged on the one page order document. No obviousness.

Col. 7, lines 51-60 refers to entering the source account number, and requisition number in the computer system.

Difference: Claim 26 enters the amount and accounts on the one page document,...
for audit control. No obviousness.

GROUP C -CLAIMS 21-23, 25

Appeal of Newly added Claims 21-23,25 Rejected Under 35 USC 103a for Obviousness over Wiecha, U.S. Patent Number 5,870,717 in view of Thomson et al, U.S. Patent Numbeer 5,121,945, Josephson, U.S. Patent Number 4,974,878, and Ivanov, U.S. Patent Number 5,706,452 as applied to claim 17, and further in view of Walker et al, U.S. Patent Number 5,794,207

WALKER'S PATENT, filed 1996, entitled, Method and Apparatus for a Cryptographically Assisted Commercial Network System Designed to Facilitate Buyer-Driven Conditional Purchase Offers, describes an agent acting for a prospective buyer of a selected product at the buyer's prescribed price and terms, to find a qualified seller.

NOTE: In the following, the Examiner gives the particular inventor credit for the same language used in the One Page Purchasing claims, thereby assuming identical performance.

13 A EXAMINER in identifying Claim 21, recognizes Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov as teaching an Electronic Commerce System, as analyzed and discussed in the claim 17 rejection, but fail to explicitly disclose a system wherein electronic signatures are required of purchaser's participating employees to acknowledge their action completed and will thus be shown to ease verification of the entire One Page document through its successive steps, and to assist the auditing functions. Walker is recognized as teaching this system.

RESPONSE: In Walker's system an electronic formed contract may be used to bind the buyer and seller, but Claim 21 only needs a vendor's invoice number to confirm the vendor's acceptance. Within the buyer's organization, participants in a purchase use electronic signatures for confirmation of action as a convenience, without moving from one's station, and with One Document, all the necessary action confirmations are contained on one document. These objectives are not similar and produce no obviousness. Reference to Walker's auditing functions would anticipate the embodiment of an independent organization, which is not to be found in his patent.....

EXAMINER identifies obviousness by modifying collective teaching of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov assisted by Walker who teaches the auditing functions, with the motivation of providing a system of bilateral buyer-driven electronic commerce.

RESPONSE: Previous teachings of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov have been disclaimed for obviousness, as responded to previously, and would not be qualified to accept assistance by Walker, who on his own merits has not shown obviousness in his patent for Claim 21, as established above, while producing a system of bilateral buyer-driven electronic commerce, which is not part of the One Page Purchasing System.

EXAMINER continues, with Walker adding the additional billing charges in Claim 22 to arrive at the total amount of the document, to match the One Page Purchasing System, plus rearranging terms of payment to suit the purchaser's needs, described in Claim 23, and use of a hand held computer for verification of order contents presented in Claim 25.

RESPONSE: No specific mention was found in the referenced patents to confirm these actions, which defeats the value of any of Walker's possible modification of the Examiner's hypothetical system, which had failed at its earlier point of establishing obviousness, thereby honoring the non obviousness of Claims, 21,22,23 and 25, and Group C.

Differences Between Rejection Sources and Claims

Group C (Claims 21,22,23,25)

Claim 21 Four unrelated subjects

 No obviousness

Claim 22 Three unrelated subjects

 No obviousness

Claim 23 Three unrelated subjects

 No obviousness

Claim 25 Four unrelated subjects

 No obviousness

Combination No obviousness

(see supporting claims)

**CLAIM 21 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

21. System as defined in claim 17, wherein electronic signatures are required of purchaser's participating employees to acknowledge their actions completed, and will thus be shown to ease verification of the entire One Page document through its successive steps, and to assist the auditing functions.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Walker: Col. 7, line 9 to Col. 8, line 20, Col. 8, lines 56 to Col. 9 line 51, Col. 17, lines 7-9, Col. 19, lines 10-12, 29-53. Fig. 10.

Col. 7, lines 9 to Col. 8, line 20 describes a buyer driven contract with a seller, arranged by a third party, keeping the buyer anonymous until the agreement is consummated. An electronic formed contract may authenticate the sale.

Difference: Claim 21 using an electronic signature does not apply to a buyer and seller relationship, but just applies within the purchaser's organization, and is used as a convenience for acknowledging completion of action, without moving from one's work station. - No obviousness.

Col. 8, lines 56 to Col. 9, line 51, describes the anonymous interest of the committed buyer and interested sellers brought together by the "agent" of the buyer, with the "agent" checking the authenticity of both parties.

Difference: - See above Difference. - No obviousness.

Col. 17, lines 7-9, recognizes lack of signature in system for a legitimate contract.

Difference – See above Difference – No obviousness.

Col. 19, lines 10-12, 29-53 refers to use of Email to transmit buyer's offer to seller, transferring the goods to the buyer and having a choice of payment.

Difference: Claim 21 just describes use of electronic signature with one page system.
– No obviousness.

Claim 21 continued

Fig. 10 illustrates an embodiment showing the binding of a conditional purchase offer

**Difference: Claim 21 only describes use of electronic signature within purchaser's
Organization -No obviousness.**

**CLAIM 22 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

- ; 22. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the total amount of the One Page document, including taxes, handling charges, etc. will be established at the outset, when the document is prepared, thereby having the correct amount for authorization approval, vendor acceptance, and payment advice to the paying bank, without the usual need for a vendor's invoice, before arranging payment.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (see Patents Section for citations)

Walker: Col. 8, lines 41-55, Col. 10, lines 40 to Col. 11, line 2, Col. 19, lines 29-45

Col. 8, lines 41-55 describes a committing purchaser of an item using an intermediary to seek a seller to meet the purchaser's price and terms.

Difference: Claim 22 takes place when the sale is consummated, with the price normally set by the seller, and price specifically including all add ons for taxes, and handling charges to recognize the full cost of the order and facilitate quick payment to the vendor upon delivery of the merchandise. These are completely different. No obviousness

Col. 10, lines 40 to Col. 11, line 2 extols the extra selling benefits provided by the intermediary organization including using anonymity between the parties and confirmed authenticity.

Difference: Claim 22 has the buyer dealing directly with the seller, in a sellers market. Completely different. . No obviousness

Col. 19; lines 29-45 describes intermediary authenticating sellers capacity to deliver which could include a digital signature on the contract.

Difference: Doesn't relat to having total amount of purchase established at the outset.(time of sal). No obviousness

**CLAIM 23 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

23. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the purchaser is required to prearrange terms of payment with the vendor, which is scheduled into the system, thereby permitting the purchaser to adjust payments to fit the purchaser's cash flow needs, and without this, the vendor would have no basis for being paid.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Walker: Col 8 lines 41-55, Col 10, lines 40-to Col. 11, line 2, Col. 19, lines 29-45

Col. 8, lines 41-45, refers to a buyer making a conditional purchase offer available for an intermediate participant to find a seller to meet the buyer's terms

Difference: Claim 23 has no such intermediate agent, the sale has been made, and just requires arranging terms of payment, No obviousness.

Col. 10, lines 40 to Col. 11, line 2.describes the benefits of using an agent to expand the search for a sell, using the anonymity of the parties.

Difference: See difference above, No. obviousness

Col. 19, lines 29-45 refers to the purchaser's agent serving to verify the authenticity and performance responsibility of the proposed seller.

Difference: See difference above, No. obviousness.

**CLAIM 25 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

25. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a member of the purchaser's receiving department uses a hand held computer and the vendor's bar code reference, to reveal the items listed on the One Page document, clicking in the space provided to confirm receipt of each item, and when the order is completely checked, the member's electronic signature will be accepted by the system, ready for the originator's signature of acceptance, thereby using the original One Page form to avoid any mistakes in identification of the order content.

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Josephson: Col. 5, lines, 59-to Col. 6, line 10, Col. 8, lines 60-67

Walker: Col. 17, lines 7-26, Col. 18, lines 33-37

Josephson:

Col. 5. lines 59 to Col. 6, line 10 refers to an installment payment program, with payment coupons having a draft form authorizing creditor to get payment by funds transfer

Difference: a package receiving department compared with an installment paying System. No obviousness.

Col. 8, lines 60-67 describes information on payment coupon for machine reading.

Difference: Information on coupon is used for accounting purposes, information in package receiving is used for checking receipt of purchases. No Obviousness.

Walker:

Claim 25 continued

Col. 17, lines 7-26, describes methods used by agent of buyer to find a seller, for contact with both, using voice mail, electronic mail, fax or postal mail.

Difference: Completely unrelated to a packaging receiving department checking items received. No obviousness.

Col. 18. lines 33-37 (see Col. 17, lines 7-26) for communication methods between agent and prospective seller.

Difference (see 17, lines 7-26), No obviousness

GROUP D - CLAIMS 29 AND 30

Appeal of Newly added claims 29-30 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wiecha, U.S. Patent Number 5,870,717 in view of Thomson et al, U.S. Patent Number 5,121,945, Josephson, U.S. Patent Number 4,974,8788 and Ivanov, U.S. Patent Number 5,706,452, as applied to claim 17 above, and further in view of Barnes et al, U.S. Patent Number 5,970,475

BARNES' PATENT filed 1997, entitled, Electronic Procurement System and Method for Trading Partners, provides a service organization to serve purchasers and vendors in processing transactions through the Internet, previously performed manually, continuing to use the same types of prevailing documents, and charging service fees to the purchaser and vendor

NOTE: In the following, the Examiner gives the particular inventor credit for the same language used in the One Page Purchasing claims, thereby assuming identical performance.

EXAMINER describes Barnes, for Claim 29, as teaching a system wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu" secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned Purchase" key on the keyboard to list sources of data, order form, etc, in completing the purchase worksheet and One Page form,- with major sources from the purchasing department. (condensed for use here)

RESPONSE: Examiner recognizes failure of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov to disclose similarities with Claim 29. Existence of a menu in a system is a common feature. The difference emerges with the application of the menu. Barnes' menu applies to the processing of a purchase order. The One Page System applies to the total 38 functions of purchasing, including reference to the worksheets made part of the system, which are not found with Barnes.

EXAMINER relates to 17 Management Reports identified in Claim 30.

RESPONSE: The above Claim 30 is hereby canceled, as being recognized in other
cont nts of the application.

NOTE: This complete the support of non obviousness for Group D, covering Claims 29
and 30, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), with the conclusion that all of these claims should be
accepted as non obvious, the prior art is not evident and the lack of prior art does not
allow sufficient awareness of ordinary skills.

\\

Title: One Page Purchasing System

Application No. 09/945,467

Difference Between Rejection Sources and Claims

Group D (Claims 29,30)

Claim 29 Examiner recognizes four patents as having no similarity with Claim.

Four difference in content

Claim 30 Canceled by inventor

**CLAIM 29 – DIFFERENCES BETWEEN EXAMINER'S PATENTS CITED
FOR OBVIOUSNESS, AND APPLICANT'S CLAIM**

29. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of information and action links, including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders, accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

Note: Examiner recognizes failure of Wiecha, Thomson, Josephson, and Ivanov to disclose similarities with above Claim

Rejection Basis for Obviousness by: (See Patents Section for citations)

Barnes: Fig. 10, Item 131f, Fig. 11, Item 134, Fig. 12, Col. 5, Lines 1-4 Col. 22, lines 36-45

Fig. 10: A block diagram representing the Main Menu at a user's terminal, after successful log in by the user at the buyer's location. Item 131f is labeled "Purchasing Instructions. The Main Menu has options for actions and provides information to the user. A total of eight categories are shown in the Main Menu.

Difference: Existence of a menu in a system is a common feature. The difference emerges with the application of the menu. Barnes' menu applies to the processing of a purchase order. The One Page System's applies to the total 38 functions of purchasing, including reference to the worksheets made part of the system, which are not found with Barnes. These are vital to provide adequate attention to the merits of the larger purchases, including justification, and should be made part of the purchase file to be referenced from the menu, which should be recognized with a claim, - not found with Barnes. Any attempt by Barnes to include all 38 purchasing functions applied to the six

CLAIM 29 continued

different forms required by Barnes' system would substantially change the content of his menu. ..No obviousness

Fig. 11 illustrates the options when an authenticated user selects the purchase option.

Difference: (see above) No obviousness

Fig. 12 is a flow chart of user templates, either creating new templates or editing templates.

Difference: This extent of templates would not be necessary with the One Page system
No obviousness.

Col. 5, lines 1-4 describes a flow chart of the options after the purchase option has been selected, limited to a purchase order.

Difference: this is a normal process of having supporting menus to main menus, with the difference being a single purchase order process vs. a total purchasing systems process. (see above) No obviousness

Col. 22, lines 36-45 describes the eight categories in Fig. 10 -Main Menu.(see above)

Difference: (see explanation in Fig. 10 above) No obviousness.

Proposed Change to serve Claim 29 in New Matters and Subject Matters.

System as defined in claim 17, wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu" secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection, such as company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided by the purchasing department.

CLAIM 30

30. System as defined in claim 17, wherein seventeen different management reports are identified to assist and control the purchasing functions at the several action points and times.

The above claim 30 is hereby canceled.

207+

ONE PAGE PURCHASING SYSTEM

ABSTRACT OF THE DISCLOSURE

The system is designed to cover about 30 steps of purchasing for the buying company, using a single document which moves electronically through these steps to accomplish the necessary action, in a tracked system. This is done without human intervention except for preparation of the document, acknowledging receipt of the merchandise, and having spot security and audit checks of its performance. An electronic program extends the system to deposit the payment due, into the bank account of the vendor. Electronic signatures and/or the invoice number assigned and inserted in the document by the vendor, are required to prove completion of each key step in the process. Control is shifted to the buyer paying from the one page document, and not from vendors' invoices and statements which normally require verification. Benefits result from the elimination of conventional purchase requisitions, purchase orders, shipping documents, vendors invoices, vendors statements, and payment checks. This reduces errors, processing delays, employees' time and materials used, - and provides very substantial dollar savings for the purchaser, vendor and bank.

Harold F. Hynes
Patent Pending

I CLAIM:

17. . Electronic Commerce System for procuring goods/services by a number of users within an organization, from a number of vendors, comprising consisting of

- (a) one page electronic purchasing document which collectively replaces individual paper and electronic purchase requisitions, purchase orders and vendors; acknowledgements, shipping notices, invoices, and statements; and successively serves their identical functions, traveling electronically between participants of the system; and
- (b) an electronic purchaser's system to introduce each One Page document to the system of serving these purchasing functions, progressively moving the document to the participants, following each step to recognize actions completed, verifications completed, actions needed, and sending the document to the next action location, coupled with a time schedule for each action, and a follow up system;
- (c) a One Page template worksheet selected by the purchase originator when securing and preparing the One Page document, to disclose justification of the purchase, possible supporting data, and in the case of contract orders, information on contract dates, purchases to date and past performance;
- (d) a purchaser's payment system activated by the operation of the One Page document, arranging payment to the vendor's bank, without individual participation within the purchaser's organization;
- (e) exclusive rights in the use of the forms contained herein, referred to as template forms, and to any other forms associated with the One Page document; and
- (f) use of a plurality of terminals, work stations, servers, Intranet and Internet programs operating with "off the shelf" software systems chosen from selections current at the time of installing the One Page System, compatible with retained legacy systems, necessary to operate the One Page System.

18. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a One Pag document used to perform the functions of the system, is selected from a choice of three forms of purchasing, by size and type of purchase, and provides for the needs of the different participants, as prepared by the originator.
19. System, as defined in claim 17, wherein during the progression of the One Page document through its functional steps, any changes found necessary will require the action of the originator, which is first processed by with the finder of the necessary changes first deleting the dot in the circle on the order which directed the action to him, and also the dot in the circle which preceded his own circle to through removing the dots shown for the present and previous action, thereby producing a template form, "Action Change Request", to secure explanations why changes are necessary, then, to be returned back into the system, in reverse sequence, for necessary action by the order originator.
- 20 . System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor acknowledges the order by inserting the vendor's invoice number in the One Page document, and Emailing it back to the purchaser's System, thereby avoiding any problems of the vendor not having a compatible electronic signature system.
21. System as defined in claim 17, wherein electronic signatures are required of those employees engaged in purchasing, purchaser's participating employees to acknowledge their assigned actions completed. which, by using the One Page document, easily permits verification of their actions completed, by others, including auditors checking for prescribed conformance in the purchasing system and will thus be shown to ease verification of the entire One Page document through its successive steps, and to assist the auditing functions.
- ; 22. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the total amount of the One Page document, including taxes, handling charges, etc. will be established at the outset,

when the document is prepared, thereby having the correct amount for authorization approval, vendor acceptance, and payment advice to the paying bank, without the usual need for a vendor's invoice, before arranging payment.

23. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the purchaser is required to prearrange terms of payment with the vendor, which is scheduled into the system, thereby permitting the purchaser to adjust payments to fit the purchaser's cash flow needs, and without this, the vendor would have no basis for being paid.

24.. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor attaches a bar code label to the outside of the order shipped, displaying the purchase document and invoice numbers, which will be used by the receiver to identify the One Page document for verification of receipt, thereby eliminating the usual shipping document.

25. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a member of the purchaser's receiving department uses a hand held computer and the vendor's bar code reference, to reveal the items listed on the One Page document, clicking in the space provided to confirm receipt of each item, and when the order is completely checked, the member's electronic signature will be accepted by the system, ready for the originator's signature of acceptance, thereby using the original One Page form to avoid any mistakes in identification of the order content.

26. System as defined in claim 17, wherein a section is contained in the One Page document for the originator to enter the amounts and accounts to be charged for the items purchased, which is entered into the system to be held in suspense until the item is received as acknowledged, and charged to that account(s) with an accounts payable entry.

27. System as defined in claim 17, wherein the vendor is permitted to put a "stop"

on the preparation and processing of their documents replaced by the system, but continuing the use of the invoice number as identified with the One Page document, thereby saving substantial work and cost for the vendor.

28. .System as defined in claim 17, wherein a Purchase Worksheet provides a choice for either fixed assets or expenses applicable to larger purchases which justify the purchase, and provides information on use of items replaced, depreciation reserves, writeoffs,, other purchases required, etc., with this worksheet made an addition to the One Page document for internal use and fitted into a program for "other purchase actions", such as accounting and taxes, along with its use for auditing the One Page System.

29. System as defined in claim 17. wherein the initiation of an order requires use of a template form "Purchase Menu", secured on the originator's monitor by pressing an assigned "Purchase" key on the keyboard, which lists a choice of 31 information and action links available for selection such as , including company purchasing policies, procedures, worksheet, order form, vendor and product sources, orders outstanding, previous orders and accounts to be charged, etc., thereby accessing the necessary information to complete the purchase worksheet when required, and the data to be inserted in the One Page form, with 75% or more of the data being provided the major sources for these data being established by the purchasing department.

REFERENCES IN PATENTS

Patents, Columns and Lines References

Figures, and Items References

Patents Selected, with References Marked

Inventors	Patent Nos.
Wiecha	5,870,717
Thomson	5,121,945
Josephson	4,974,878
Johnson	6,023,683
Ivanov	5,706,452
Walker	5,794,207
Barnes	5,970,475

Columns and Lines Referenced in Patents for Claims Comparisons

Claim	Wiecha Col.	Wiecha Lines	Walker Col.	Walker Lines	Thomson Col.	Thomson Lines	Josephson Col.	Josephson Lines	Barns Col.	Barns Lines	Johnson Col.	Johnson Lines	Ivanov Col.	Ivanov Lines
17	3	54-61												
17a	2	12-19			2	56-67								
	7	64-65			4	{ 68								
	8	8-21			5	+ 65								
	9	16-52			12	25 7	6	{ 66						
17b	7	9-16					7	25						
	7	40-45					16	24-28						
12	39-67													
13	{ 26													
14	{ 2													
17c	4	52-54												
	6	29-34												
	7	9-16												
	10	4-11												
	10	23-26												
17d							5	44-56						
							6	29-45						
							6	50-58						
							7	61-65						
							16	10-27						
17e													6	25-31
													17	50 {
													18	21 {
													25	1-11
													29	66 {
													30	8
													17	50-51
17f	1	57												
	2	37												
18													18	55-67
													15	45-49
19													13	28 {
													14	11
													15	60 {
													16	32
20	7	10-16												
	9	60-63												
	10	38-44												
	10	50-52												
	12	48-51												
	13	9-11												
	15	12-23												

Columns and Lines Referenced in Patents for Claims Comparisons

	Wiecha		Walker		Thomson		Josephson		Barnes		Johnson		Ivanov	
Claim	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines	Col.	Lines
21			7 8 8 9 17 11 19	9 20 56 51 7-9 10-12 29-53										
22			8 10 11 19	41-55 40 2 29-45										
23			8 10 11 19	41-55 40 2 29-45										
24					15 16	30 10								
25			17 18	7-26 33-37			5 6 8	59 10 60-67						
26											6 7 7	39 12 51-60		
27							6 12	50-58 10-58						
28	4 6 7 10 10	52-54 29-34 9-16 4-11 25-26												
29	5 22	1-4 36-45												
30									9 9 10 18	4-14 49-50 4-11 10-31				